



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/810,303	03/16/2001	Bartlett Scott Hudson Michel	D-427	9104

7590 12/28/2005

Derrick M. Reid
Patent Attorney
The Aerospace Corporation
P. O. Box 92957 (M1/040)
Los Angeles, CA 90009-2957

EXAMINER

DENNISON, JERRY B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/810,303

Applicant(s)

MICHEL, BARTLETT SCOTT
HUDSON

Examiner

J. Bret Dennison

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. 12/15/2005.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Action is in response to Amendment for Application Number 09/810,303 received on 1 September 2005.
2. Claims 1-15 are presented for examination.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-15 are objected to because of the following informalities:

3. There are instances within the independent claims in which the use of commas would clarify the claim language and improve the readability of the claims.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Interpretation

4. The Examiner emphasizes for the record that the claims employ broad language including the use of words and phrases such as "proximal IPA", "distal web IPA", and "distal URL identifier", which have broad meanings in the art and have multiple embodiments and interpretations that extend beyond the scope of the specification. In addition, the Applicant has not argued any narrower interpretation of the claim language, nor amended the claims significantly enough to construe a narrower meaning to the limitations.

Since the claim breath allows multiple interpretations, meanings, and embodiments, which are broader than Applicant's disclosure, the Examiner is required to interpret the claim limitations in terms of their broadest reasonable interpretations while determining patentability of the disclosed invention. See MPEP § 2111. See *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000), and *In re*

American Academy of Science Tech Center, 2004 WL 1067528 (Fed. Cir. May 13, 2004).

Any term that is not clearly defined in the specification must be given its plain meaning as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. See MPEP 2111.01. See also *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989), *Sunrace Roots Enter. Co. v. SRAM Corp.*, 336 F.3d 1298, 1302, 67 USPQ2d 1438, 1441 (Fed. Cir. 2003), *Brookhill-Wilk 1, LLC v. Intuitive Surgical, Inc.*, 334 F.3d 1294, 1298 67 USPQ2d 1132, 1136 (Fed. Cir. 2003).

The interpretation of the claims by their broadest reasonable interpretation reduces the possibility that, once the claims are issued, the claims are interpreted more broadly than justified. See *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551 (CCPA 1969). Also, limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Therefore, the failure to significantly narrow the definition or scope of the claims and supply arguments commensurate in scope with the claims implies the Applicant intends broad interpretation be given to the claims. Such broad interpretation is shown in the rejections provided in this Office Action.

The terms "proximal IPA", "distal web IPA", and "distal URL identifier" recited in the claims will be given their broadest reasonable interpretation and will be interpreted by the Examiner that is consistent with the disclosures of the specification and the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach. See MPEP § 2111.

Examiner was unable to locate clear and precise meanings of the terms in the Specification, and respectfully requests Applicant to indicate the portions of the Specification that provide their definitions.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Claims 1-15 include the terms "proximal" and "distal". It is unclear to Examiner in determining the metes and bounds of these terms. Examiner cannot determine a basis for what an "internet protocol address (IPA)" is proximal or distal to, in the claims. In order for such terms to have any meaning in the claims, they must be relative to a point of reference. For example, determining the distances from a node to more than one address, and then determining which one is the proximal address relative to that node. There is no indication of a point of reference that the proximal IPA is "close to" or what the distal IPA is "furthest from". Therefore, the meanings behind these terms are unclear to Examiner and the IP addresses may be interpreted as "proximal" or "distal" to anything in the network.

6. Claim 9 recites the limitation "the distal destination" in line 24. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
7. Claim 9 recites the limitation "the destination IPA" in line 24. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
8. Claim 9 recites the limitation "the distal web cache" in line 26. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
9. Claim 12 recites the limitation "the distal cache" in lines 8-9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
10. Claim 12 recites the limitation "the destination IPA" **multiple times** in lines 10, 16, 18, and 19. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
11. Claim 12 recites the limitation "the destination URL identifier" in lines 13-14. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
12. Claim 12 recites the limitation "the destination" in line 19. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
13. Claim 12 recites the limitation "the distal cache" in line 20. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
14. Claim 13 recites limitations such as "storing the distal URL identifier with a respective next one of the one or more intermediate IPAs", and "and lastly the distal IPA" and "each of the one or more intermediate IPAs being a location a next one of the

one or more", the limitations causing ambiguities as to the steps of the claim. Examiner is unclear what these limitations mean.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by (U.S. Patent Number 6,154,738).

15. Regarding claim 1, Call disclosed a method for retrieving, from a destination, web content data specified by a source at a source internet protocol address (IPA) and corresponding to a uniform resource locator (URL) associated with a web server, the method comprising the steps of,

storing at a proximal IPA in a forwarding table a destination IPA (Call, col. 7, lines 18-23, 45-50, col. 8, lines 40-50),

storing at the proximal IPA in the forwarding table a destination URL identifier for identifying the web content data, the destination URL identifier is stored in the forwarding table in reference to the destination IPA (col. 8, lines 40-50, Call disclosed a

cross-referencing table that cross-references universal product codes with an IP address, col. 16, lines 1-10, Call disclosed a client making a URL request that includes the universal product code),

receiving from the source a source URL identifier, matching the source URL identifier to the destination URL identifier (Call, col. 16, lines 1-10, Call disclosed a client making a URL request, in which the request is used to match against either a URL or IP address, col. 7, lines 39-50),

cross referencing at the proximal IPA in the forwarding table the stored destination URL identifier with the destination IPA (Call, col. 7, lines 40-50), transmitting the destination URL identifier to the destination at the destination IPA for transmitting from the destination at the destination IPA the web content data to retrieve the web content data from the destination (Call, col. 7, lines 49-55).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9 and 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Call (U.S. Patent Number 6,154,738).

16. Regarding claims 9 and 12, Call disclosed a method for retrieving, from a distal web cache, web content data specified by a user browser at a source internet protocol address (IPA) and corresponding to a uniform resource locator (URL) associated with a web server, the method comprising the steps of,

storing at a proximal IPA in a forwarding table a distal IPA (Call, col. 7, lines 18-23, 45-50, col. 8, lines 40-50),

storing at the proximal IPA in the forwarding table a distal URL identifier for identifying the web content data stored in mirroring servers (Call, col. 5, lines 45-50), the distal URL identifier is stored in the forwarding table in reference to the destination IPA (col. 8, lines 40-50, Call disclosed a cross-referencing table that cross-references universal product codes with an IP address, col. 16, lines 1-10, Call disclosed a client making a URL request that includes the universal product code),

receiving at the proximal IPA from the user browser a source URL identifier, matching at the proximal IPA the source URL identifier to the destination URL identifier (Call, col. 16, lines 1-10, Call disclosed a client making a URL request, in which the request is used to match against either a URL or IP address, col. 7, lines 39-50),

cross referencing at the proximal IPA in the forwarding table the stored distal URL identifier with the destination IPA (Call, col. 7, lines 40-50), and

transmitting from the proximal IPA the destination URL identifier to the destination at the destination IPA for transmitting from the destination at the destination

Art Unit: 2143

IPA the web content data to retrieve the web content data from the destination (Call, col. 7, lines 49-55).

Call disclosed the web content data being stored in mirrored servers (Call, col. 5, lines 43-58).

The definition of a “mirror” in the server environment is as follows (as provided by High-Tech Dictionary,

<http://web.archive.org/web/20010108100100/http://www.computeruser.com/resources/dictionary/definition.html?lookup=3702>):

“Definition for: mirror

- to create a site on a network which is a duplicate of another site, so more users can access a busy site. The closest mirror site to the user will provide the fastest access.”

However Call remains silent as to the types of mirroring servers. This would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to look for types of mirrored servers that perform the functionality of providing information faster to the requesting device, benefiting the main server by offloading servicing the same request multiple times.

Caching, as defined by the Instant Specification, consists of storing web content data with the expectation that the stored copies will be repeatedly requested (see Instant Specification, page 3, lines 24-26), the purpose of caching being to reduce both the number of requests received by the web server where the desired content data is located, while providing a faster web interaction experience for the user (see Instant Specification, page 3, line 26 through page 4, line).

As shown by the provided definitions above, a cache server includes the same functionality as a mirrored server, both containing duplicates of content data, and both providing the content data faster to the requesting device.

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute caching servers for the mirroring servers in order to provide content data faster to the requesting device allowing more users to access by offloading to the caching servers benefiting the main server by reduce both the number of requests received by the web server where the desired content data is located, while providing a faster web interaction experience for the user (see Instant Specification, page 3, line 26 through page 4, line) allowing more users to access a busy site (High-Tech Dictionary, see definition of "mirror").

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nazem et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,983,227).

17. Regarding claims 1, 9, and 12, Nazem disclosed a method for retrieving from a destination web content data specified by a source at a source internet protocol address (IPA) and corresponding to a uniform resource locator (URL) (Nazem, col. 2, lines 55-67, Nazem disclosed providing the domain portion of a URL, therefore corresponding to the URL) associated with a web server, the method comprising the steps of,

storing at a proximal IPA in a forwarding table a destination IPA (Nazem, col. 3, lines 1-5, Nazem teaches IP addresses stored in an name server),

storing at the proximal IPA in the forwarding table a destination domain identifier for identifying the web content data, the destination domain identifier is stored in the forwarding table in reference to the destination IPA (Nazem, col. 3, lines 1-5, Nazem teaches determining an actual IP address from a domain in the name server),

receiving at the proximal IPA from the source a source domain identifier, matching at the proximal IPA the source domain identifier to the destination domain identifier (Nazem, col. 2, line 66 through col. 3, line 5, Nazem teaches the browser submitting a URL identifier to the name server, and the name server matching the identifier with the actual IP address, providing the IP address),

cross-referencing at the proximal IPA in the forwarding table the stored destination domain identifier with the destination IPA (Nazem, col. 3, lines 1-5, Nazem teaches finding the actual IP address from the domain, which inherently means that the domain identifier is cross referenced with the IP address), and

transmitting from the proximal IPA the destination domain identifier to the destination at the destination IPA (Nazem, col. 3, lines 1-20, Nazem teaches transmitting the domain to the proper page server), for

transmitting from the destination at the destination IPA the web content data to retrieve the web content data from the destination (Nazem, col. 3, lines 15-35, Nazem teaches the page servers, which include caching of web content, Fig. 2, 214, the page servers transmitting the web content).

Nazem also disclosed the client's browser making a request for a particular page by specifying a URL for the page, in which the browser submits the domain portion of

Art Unit: 2143

the URL to a server to determine an actual IP address for a page server containing the requested content (Nazem, col. 1, line 60 through col. 3, line 15).

Nazem did not explicitly state submitting a URL to be used to determine the actual IP address.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate submitting a URL, for determining an actual IP address that contains the requested page, into Nazem since the request in Nazem is the domain portion based on a URL submitted to the browser. Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the actual URL for the domain portion in the request since the same IP address would be determined.

18. Regarding claim 2, Nazem disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 1, including wherein,

the destination is a distal web cache (Nazem, col. 3, lines 10-15),

the source is a user browser at a source IPA (Nazem, col. 2, lines 65-67),

the source URL identifier is an exact URL (Nazem, col. 2, lines 59-67),

the proximal IPA is an IPA of a proximal web cache (Nazem, col. 3, lines 1-5, Nazem teaches a name server, which it is inherent that a name server is a cache),

the distal web cache transmits the web content data to the source at the source IPA (Nazem, col. 3, lines 10-15),

the method further comprising the steps of

receiving the source IPA at the proximal web cache (Nazem, col. 3, lines 1-5),
and

transmitting the source IPA to the distal web cache, the
distal cache transmitting the web content data to the user browser (Nazem, col. 3, lines
1-20).

19. Regarding claim 3, Nazem disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as
described in claim 1, including wherein,

the destination is a distal web cache (Nazem, col. 3, lines 10-15),

the destination IPA is a distal web cache IPA (Nazem, col. 3, lines 10-15)

the source is a user browser at a source IPA (Nazem, col. 2, lines 65-67),

the source URL identifier is an exact URL (Nazem, col. 2, lines 59-67),

the destination URL identifier is an encoded URL (Nazem, col. 3, lines 5-10),

the proximal IPA is an IPA of a proximal web cache (Nazem, col. 3, lines 1-5,

Nazem teaches a name server, which it is inherent that a name server is a cache),

the distal web cache transmits the web content data to the proximal web cache
(Nazem, col. 3, lines 10-15, Nazem teaches the distal cache sending the web content
data to the client's computer, which inherently contains a cache),

the method further comprising the steps of

receiving the source IPA at the proximal web cache (Nazem, col. 3, lines 1-15),

transmitting the proximal IPA to the distal web cache (Nazem, col. 3, lines 1-15),

receiving from the distal web cache the web content data at the proximal web cache (Nazem, col. 3, lines 10-15), and

transmitting the web content data from the proximal web cache to the user browser at the source IPA (Nazem, col. 3, lines 10-15).

20. Regarding claim 4, Nazem disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 1, including wherein the destination URL identifier in the forwarding table is a series of compression codes corresponding to respective linked segments of the URL, each of the linked segments corresponding to one or more components of the URL to decompose the URL into the linked segments, the linked segments are linked by parental pointers from a first linked segment having no parental pointer through remaining linked segments having respective parental pointers to a preceding one of the linked segments to a last linked segment reference to the destination IPA (Nazem, col. 2, line 66 through col. 3, line 5, Nazem teaches the browser submitting a URL identifier to the name server, and the name server matching the identifier with the actual IP address).

21. Regarding claim 5, Nazem disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 4, including wherein

the destination URL identifier references the URL comprising scheme, name, path and type components and delimiters (Nazem, col. 2, lines 59-67),

the linked segments correspond to successive concatenated components of the URL and are respectively referenced to one or more of the successive concatenated components of the URL (Nazem, col. 2, lines 59-67),

each of the compression codes are referenced to the linked segments and to the one or more successive concatenated components through pointers for respectively cross referencing the compression codes to the linked segments (Nazem, col. 2, line 59 through col. 3, line 15, Nazem teaches cross referencing URL's with IP addresses), and the destination IPA is referenced to the destination URL identifier when the all or the respective compression codes through the respective pointers point to a complete set of linked segments from the first linked segment to the last linked segment (Nazem, col. 2, line 59 through col. 3, line 15, Nazem teaches cross referencing URL's with IP addresses).

22. Regarding claim 7, Nazem disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 1, including wherein the destination stores a set of web content data one of which is the web content data, the set of web content data corresponding to a wildcard URL for indicating a set of URLs one of which is the URL (Nazem, col. 3, lines 15-20),

the destination URL identifier is a wildcard URL identifier (Nazem, col. 3, lines 1-25),

the source URL identifier is an exact URL having a plurality of URL components a first of portion of which serving as a prefix to a remaining portion of the exact URL (Nazem, col. 2, last paragraph), and

the matching step is a prefix matching step for matching the first portion of the URL components of the exact URL to the wildcard URL identifier in the forwarding table (Nazem, col. 2, last paragraph).

23. Regarding claim 8, Nazem disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 7, but does not explicitly state wherein the prefix matching step is a longest prefix matching step serving to match the longest first portion of the URL components of the exact URL to the wildcard URL among a plurality of wildcard URLs matching a shorter first portion of the URL components of the exact URL. However it would have been obvious to one in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate matching the longest portion of the URL in order to obtain the correct IP address from the forwarding table, which is the function of the forwarding table.

24. Regarding claim 10, Nazem disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 9, including wherein the web content data is transmitted from the distal cache to the user browser during the transmitting step ((Nazem, col. 3, lines 15-35, Nazem teaches the page servers transmitting the web content to the user's browser).

25. Regarding claim 11, Nazem disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 9, including wherein

the proximal IPA is a location of a proximal cache (Nazem, col. 3, lines 1-15);

the web content data is transmitted from the distal cache to the proximal cache during the transmitting steps (Nazem, Fig. 2, 214, col. 3, lines 1-23); and the web content data is further transmitted from the proximal cache to the user browser during the transmitting step (Nazem, col. 3, lines 1-15).

Claims 6 and 13-15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nazem in view of Rune (U.S. Patent Number 6,304,913).

26. Regarding claims 6 and 13, Nazem disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claims 5 and 12. Nazem does not disclose wherein the proximal IPA becomes a new source IPA as the destination IPA becomes a new proximal IPA communicating the destination URL identifier to a new destination IPA all of which occurring a plurality of times for indicating a number of hops from the proximal IPA to a last one of a respective plurality of new destination IPAs, the last one of the respective plurality of new destination IPA distally storing the web content data, and the last linked segment is further referenced to a distance metric indicating a number of hops through the new destination IPAs from the proximal IPA.

In an analogous art of networking, Rune disclosed a system where data is passed between a plurality of routers, wherein each router contains a routing table for storing hop counts to obtain the distance of the destination (Rune, col. 4, lines 29-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate counting the number of hops it takes to get from

source to destination for the benefit of determining the best route from the source to the destination (Rune, see Abstract).

27. Regarding claim 14, Nazem and Rune disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 13 including wherein the repeated transmitting step, the web content data is transmitting from the distal cache through the one or more intermediate web caches (Rune, col. 4, lines 25-40) and through a proximal cache at the proximal IPA to the user browser (Nazem, Fig. 2, 214, col. 3, lines 1-23).

28. Regarding claim 15, Nazem and Rune disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 14. Nazem and Rune do not explicitly state the step of assigning the proximal cache and one or more intermediate caches and the distal cache to one or more groups of cooperative caches in a network of grouped cooperative web caches, the web content data being transmitted from a first one of the one or more intermediate caches to a second one of the one or more intermediate caches, the first one and second one of the one or more intermediate caches being within the same group. However, it would have been obvious to one in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to realize that cooperative caches are assigned into groups if they are within the same network.

Response to Amendment

29. Applicant's arguments and amendments filed on 01 September 2005 have been carefully considered but they are not deemed fully persuasive.

30. Applicant states, "the invention is directed to forming a proximal web cache that functions as both a forwarding table and a routing table".

Independent claim 1 does not even mention a cache.

Independent claims 9 and 12 only recite retrieving web content from a cache, the web content specified by a user's browser.

Examiner does not see where, in the independent claims that the invention is "directed to forming a proximal web cache that functions as both a forwarding table and a routing table".

31. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 have been fully considered but they are not fully persuasive. Applicant's arguments include the failure of previously applied art to expressly a "WEB cache" [see Applicant's Response, page 12] and that "there is no reference in Nazem as to caching or storing the generated or produced web content data" [see Applicant's Response, page 13].

It is evident from the mappings found in the above rejection that Nazem disclosed the teaching of a cache 214 at the page server 104 of Fig. 2.

Art Unit: 2143

32. Examiner agrees with Applicant's arguments regarding the cross-referencing of URL-to-IPA [see Applicant's Response, page 14]. Nazem disclosed cross-referencing of domain-to-IPA in order to determine the IPA of where the content is stored. Nazem also disclosed how the domain portion is obtained from a URL submitted by the browser (Nazem, col. 2, lines 60 to col. 3, line 15). Since the request in Nazem includes the domain portion based on a URL submitted to the browser, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the actual URL for the domain portion in the request since the same IP address would be determined.

33. It is evident from the mappings found in the above rejection that Nazem disclosed the teaching of a domain name server which cross-references URL identifiers to IP addresses. Further, it is clear from the numerous teachings (previously and currently cited) that the provision for using "lookup tables to find web content" was widely implemented in the networking art.

34. Amending the claims to overcome the 112 issues and objections would clarify the claimed invention, enabling Examiner to provide a more precise search and consideration.

35. Applicant only claims a cross-referencing a URL identifier with an IP address. By Nazem including determining an actual IP address from the URL, Nazem shows that using lookup tables to find the destination IP address is well known in the art.

Thus, Applicant's arguments drawn toward distinction of the claimed invention and the prior art teachings on this point are not considered persuasive. It is also clear to the Examiner that Nazem clearly taught the independent claims of the Applicant's claimed invention.

Furthermore, as it is Applicant's right to continue to claim as broadly as possible their invention, it is also the Examiner's right to continue to interpret the claim language as broadly as possible. It is the Examiner's position that the detailed functionality that allows for Applicant's invention to overcome the prior art used in the rejection, fails to differentiate in detail how these features are unique. As it is extremely well known in the networking art as already shown by Nazem as well as other prior arts of records disclosed, IP lookup tables are taught as well as other claimed features of Applicant's invention. By the rejection above, the applicant must submit amendments to the claims in order to distinguish over the prior art use in the rejection that discloses different features of Applicant's claimed invention.

36. It is the Examiner's position that Applicant has not yet submitted claims drawn to limitations, which define the operation and apparatus of Applicant's disclosed invention in manner, which distinguishes over the prior art.

37. Failure for Applicant to significantly narrow definition/scope of the claims and supply arguments commensurate in scope with the claims implies the Applicant intends

Art Unit: 2143

broad interpretation be given to the claims. The Examiner has interpreted the claims with scope parallel to the Applicant in the response and reiterates the need for the Applicant to more clearly and distinctly define the claimed invention.

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Bret Dennison whose telephone number is (571)272-3910. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571)272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



JBD



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100